

In his Memoirs, Jahángír says that he solicited the hand of the daughter of Jagat Singh Kachhwáhá, son to Rájá Mán Singh of Jaipur, but his suit having been rejected by Ráo Bhoj of Búndí, the girl's maternal grandfather, he had a mind to return from Kábul to India, to punish the Ráo for his insolence, who, however, was dead before Jahángír's return.

When the Búndí Rájás threw off the allegiance to the Maháránás of Udaipur and entered into the Imperial service in S. 1625 (A. D. 1568), they had made a contract with Akbar, not to marry their daughters to the Moslem emperors; and like the Udaipur House they looked down upon those Rájás who had done so; and it was for this reason that Ráo Bhoj objected to his granddaughter being made a Begam.

Summary.

An attempt has been made in this paper to show that Jagángír's mother was a lady, Hindú by origin, having been the daughter of Rájá Bhár Mall of Jaipur; that Salímah Sultán was Jahángír's step-mother, and that the Hindú Rájás did not offer their daughters voluntarily to the Muhammadan emperors, but they gave their daughters, when solicited by the emperors, to contract marriage ties with them.

Remarks on the above paper.—By H. BEVERIDGE, ESQ., C. S.

I am very glad that the subject has been taken up, and I am much obliged to Kaviráj Shyámál Dás for pointing out that the *Khuláshatu-t-Tawárikh* gives Bihári Mall's daughter as the mother of Jahángír. The question is, if this is a sufficient authority. The *Khuláshatu-t-Tawárikh* has not, I believe, ever been printed, but the MS. in the Society's Library is in accordance with the Kaviráj's statement. Munshí Subhán Rái (the name given him by Elliot) wrote at the end of the 17th century, in the time of Aurangzáb and some seventy years after Jahángír's death. He is therefore not a contemporary historian, and we do not know whence he got the fact about Bihári Mall's daughter. According to Colonel Lees, Subhán Rái is a good writer, but Sir Henry Elliot speaks very disparagingly of him. Many, however, may think his statement sufficient to determine the point. The other authorities, quoted by the Kaviráj, do not, I think, strengthen Subhán Rái's evidence, as they are very modern. Ghulám Husain Khán, the earliest of them, wrote about a century ago, and his statement seems to have been merely copied from

Subhán Rái. It seems that, as regards the times before his own, this writer is a mere plagiarist from Subhán Rái or some other munshí. Besides he clearly is not accurate, for he describes the marriage of Bihárá Mall's daughter as having taken place after the capture of Chitor, whereas it occurred six years previously.

I still think the silence of all the leading historians remarkable. Neither Abu-l-Fazl, nor Nizámu-d-dín, nor Badáoní, nor Firishtah nor Kháfi Khán mentions Bihárá Mall's daughter as Jahángír's mother. This cannot have been the result of bigotry; for Abu-l-Fazl, at least, was no bigot, and he and some of the others mention the marriage of Bihárá Mall's daughter with approval. If they approved of the marriage, why should they not have approved of its resulting in the birth of a son? They distinctly mention that Bhag'wán Dás' daughter was the mother of Khusrú. The Mu'áşiru-l-Umará, now being printed by the Society, is a modern book, but it is an elaborate one, and was highly thought of by Professor Blochmann. It has biographies of Bihárá Mall and his sons, but it nowhere mentions that Bihárá Mall's daughter gave birth to Jahángír.

I have consulted the MS. of the Tawárikh-i-Salím in our library. The statement there is exactly as Price (p. 19) translates it, that Jahángír married a *daughter* of Bihárá Mall, and had by her his son Khusrú. This daughter might possibly be a younger sister of the one who married Akbar, but the statement that she was the mother of Khusrú is certainly wrong. Undoubtedly his mother was the daughter of Bhag'wán. As for the passage about Pahár Khán, or Bahádur Khán, as it is in our MS., the Kaviráj's remark, about the lax use of the word brother, is irrelevant as the word in the autobiography is uncle and not brother. The statement (Price, p. 34) is that Pahár Khán was a dignitary of 2000 and the uncle of Rájá Mán Singh, and that his sister was in Akbar's haram, but no favourite with destiny. A Bahár Khán or Bahádur Khán is mentioned in Abu-l-Fazl's list of Akbar's grandees. He is No. 87, and is described as one of the ghuláms or slaves of Humáyún, so that he may have been originally a Hindú, like I'timád Khán of Gujrát, but how he came to be Rájá Mán Singh's uncle, I do not know. There is a curious statement in the Tawárikh-i-Salím (Price, p. 47), that Akbar had a son by BÍbí Maryam who was placed under the care of Rájá Bihárá Mall. Could this be the BÍbí Maryam about whom there seem to be traditions at Fathpúr Síkrí?

The Kaviráj speaks of traditions and of the historians of Ráj-pútáná, but Tod and others do not mention any tradition about Bihárá Mall's daughter. On the contrary, Tod tells us that the name of Bhag'wán Dás is execrated in Rájputáná, because he was the first who

allied himself with the Moghul. This statement is repeated in the Political History of Jaipur by Col. Brooke. (Government Selections, No. 65, p. 14.) It is, however, certainly wrong, for there is no doubt that his father had previously given his daughter in marriage to Akbar. I admit, fully, that if a Rájput lady was the mother of Jahángír, there is better authority for her having been Bihárí Mall's daughter, than for her having been of the Jodhpur family. I cannot find that Udai Singh, or the Moṭá Rájá gave his sister to Akbar, though he gave his daughter to Jahángír, and it would appear that Chandra Sen's introduction to Akbar and the marriage of his sister or other relative to Akbar did not take place till the 15th year of the reign, that is, after Jahángír's birth. I also admit that there are great difficulties in the way of holding that either Salímah or Ruqiyyah Begam was the mother of Jahángír. But I still think it not established that his mother was Bihárí Mall's daughter. Perhaps the *Tárikh-i-Alfí* would throw light on the subject, but our Society's copy of that work is incomplete, and does not come down to Akbar's time. Possibly too, if discreet inquiries were made at the Court of Jaipur, the truth might be ascertained.

~~~~~

*Kudarkoṭ Inscription of Takshadatta.*—By A. FÜHRER, PH. D.

This inscription is on a white sandstone slab, which was found, in 1875, amongst the ruins of the old fort of Kudarkoṭ, a small village in tahsíl Bidhúna, 24 miles north-east of Etáwah, in the North-Western Provinces. That Kundarkoṭ was once a place of some importance, is evident from the rise and height of the mound upon which it is built, and the number of large bricks and sculptured stones scattered about the place. That it is a place of great antiquity, is proved by this inscription. The original slab is now in the Lucknow Museum, having been presented by Dr. W. Hoey, C. S., in December 1886, who found it at Etáwah in the Collector's godown, an open shed affording no proper protection for such a treasure.

The slab measures 2' 6½" × 1' 5" × 3". The most interesting point about this inscription is the character of the letters. On the whole they show the later *Gupta* type; but the mason has taken out the *kānas*, *i. e.*, the vertical strokes for the long *á*, and placed them above the letters after which they are to be read. The medial *i* is also highly ornamented. In this respect, as well as in the form of letters, the inscription resembles the Asígarh seal of S'arvavarman, published in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol.